New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials —Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, including Postage: IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

	One Year	Six Months	Three Months	One Month
Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$2.50	$1.00
Daily only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75
Sunday only	3.00	1.50	.75	.30
Sunday only, Canada	5.00	2.50	1.25	.50

FOREIGN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$24.00	$12.00	$6.00	$2.25
Daily only	18.00	9.00	4.50	1.50
Sunday only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

Returning the Railroads

A questionnaire, submitted to 13,424 editors and eliciting responses from 5,992, asked (1) whether public opinion in their localities favored a return of the railroads to private ownership and operation; (2) if not, was this adverse opinion based in part on a desire to see competition in service and facilities restored; (3) the general judgment concerning the proposal to extend government operation for five years.

On the first question 83 per cent voted yes; on the second, 75 per cent; on the third, 74 per cent against extending the period of government operation.

On the generalities of the railroad question, if the editors correctly assess public opinion, there is thus substantial unanimity, for with the minorities are reckoned all who are doubtful. The American people have had a year and one-half of McAdoo-Hines railroad management, and they don't like it.

But this negative conclusion does not carry far—helps little toward any affirmative solution. The question is not so much whether the railroads shall be returned, but under what conditions. To turn them back under the conditions that existed, plus the new adverse conditions, would give little ground for hope of improvement.

The railroads were in the breakers when the government took them over. They had lost two essential attributes of private ownership. They controlled neither their income nor their outgo. Higher rates have added a billion to income, but expenditures, chiefly in higher wages, are up a billion and a half. Private managers would struggle nearly as vainly to reduce the balance as government agents have done. Railroad managers, whether public or private, are not miracle workers and cannot draw rabbits from an empty hat.

The work of education on the railway question is not finished. It is scarcely begun. Having destroyed railway prosperity in one burst of hysterical unreason, it will do no particular good to bundle them back to their former owners in another burst. No one seems seriously to want to invest money in or to keep money in the railway business unless there is a reasonable prospect of getting it back. The realities cannot be successfully glozed over either at Washington or in the office of the committees working to bring government operation to an end.

Must the Yeowoman Go?

There is opposition in the Naval Affairs Committee of the House to the continued enlistment of women in the navy. There are now more than eight thousand filling yeomen's positions, and naval officers testify to their efficiency. The emergency of war made their services exceedingly valuable. Should they not be retained in time of peace? Those who would have them dismissed do not offer very cogent arguments. Thus, when Captain Leigh, the acting chief of the Bureau of Navigation, urged that they be retained for at least a year, Mr. Butler, the chairman of the committee, countered with the retort, "Why don't you get 200,000 women in and let all the men out of the navy?" But this is a superficial *reductio ad absurdum*. No one has pretended that a woman could fill any and every place.

No doubt the appearance of women in naval uniform was a bit of a shock to the public at first. Many refused to take these "yeomanettes" seriously. Most of them looked very well in this regulation attire, only slightly modified to fit the sex of the wearer. Perhaps many of them were attracted to the service for this reason. The war has shown that "gold lace has a charm for the fair" even when they wear it themselves. What with emergency aids and various other war workers, it seemed as if half the women had discarded the customary feminine garb. If in some cases it was regarded as a sacrifice, there was no evidence to that effect. On the contrary, the return to "civies" has often been reluctant.

There will be a missing note of color in the streets if the yeowomen disappear. But there are other than æsthetic reasons for keeping them in the service. They are not to be reckoned as merely Sir Josephus's sisters and cousins and aunts. "They do all the clerical work that men can do," says Captain Leigh, "and in many cases they do it better." It is idle to talk of unfair competition with men in these days, when the women are taking all sorts of jobs and making good with them. Will not the Naval Affairs Committee have a heart and spare, oh, spare the yeowoman?

Our After-the-Peace Army

General March was not indulging in hyperbole when he told the House Military Affairs Committee that it would be impossible for the army to function under the Hay law of 1916. It will have to function under that law, after the peace treaty is signed, unless Congress modernizes Mr. Hay's bungling work.

The Hay act was pacifistic in inspiration and reactionary in effect. It sought to perpetuate the military system which we inherited from the era of the War of 1812. It made the regular army a sort of constabulary, doing duty in small units and in a primitive police way. Modern armies had raised their working unit to the division—of from 12,000 to 18,000 men. But in our army, up to 1917, it was extremely difficult to collect more than a couple of brigades—six or seven thousand men—at any one point or for any one occasion.

The Hay act permitted a moderate increase in the strength of the regular army, which might have been expanded in the course of five years to 175,000 men, if sufficient recruits had been obtainable. But Mr. Hay saw to it that the old limitations on military efficiency were preserved. The army was prevented from developing into a real army. It remained a shell—from the modern point of view almost a toy.

As General March points out, a return to the Hay law would abolish the tank corps, the air service, the motor transport corps and various other new and now essential services. Under the Hay law, for instance, the air service was a minor adjunct of the Signal Corps. Now it is the fourth arm of the military establishment, taking rank with the infantry, the cavalry and the artillery. It could not survive if reduced to the petty rôle assigned it in the army reorganization of 1916.

Whatever its size hereafter, the regular army must be a highly trained organization, capable of fighting according to up-to-date methods. The new combat and auxiliary branches must therefore be enlarged and the infantry must be concentrated into divisional units, instead of being scattered far and wide in tiny detachments, assigned to police work. The Hay maximum of 175,000 in peace time has become inadequate. But, worse than that, the whole Hay conception of what constitutes an army is obsolete.

It will take Congress some time to work out a permanent military policy. But while that problem is being solved it would be foolish to relapse to the status of three years ago. The army and the country have far outgrown the dwarfing provisions of Mr. Hay's Arcadian scheme.

Commercial Diplomacy

Mr. Hurley, of the Shipping Board, has declared for the operation of the new American merchant marine under a system approximating to universal subsidy. The ships are to be sold or leased to operators, who are to be practically insured against loss. On special routes, if earnings do not at first suffice to meet charges, the Treasury is to assume the deficit. Foreigners will scarcely consider arrangements of such a character, which would favor American trade, as making for "the establishment of an equality of trade conditions."

Great Britain, which for seventy-five years has followed a policy of trade equality, now considers a change. Colonial preference, long talked of, seems likely to come in some form. British thought, moreover, does not run toward giving to Germany a dumping place. The license system, developed by war necessities, will continue and nullify in large measure "the most favored nation" clauses of commercial treaties. Britain must provide work for her demobilized soldiers, and for industrial rehabilitation something akin to protectionism may be anticipated.

France seems firmly resolved not to suffer again the alien economic permeation which made her in many things a German province. She has listed certain industries as "basic" and purposes to reserve them for her nationals.

Italy, economically the most dependent of the principal European nations, hopes to supply her coal deficiency by harnessing water powers and her lack of metals by developing ore bodies in her possessions. The new Italy will struggle hard to become self-sufficient, and this does not mean "economic freedom."

The new Russia after her present crisis is over will strive to keep out the Germans—to her a disintegrating pest. As to the new nations, their fervid patriotism will lead them to develop economic independence for national safety. In the new era more, rather than less, trade barriers may be foreseen. Idealists will demonstrate this should not be so, but facts will continue to be facts. For a number of years the nations are likely to be highly suspicious.

The old protectionism is losing strength in this country, but tariff problems are to be more acute and complex than ever. We have need of commercial diplomatists—of negotiators able to get something for something. The solution will be difficult, for the country is ill supplied with men competent for the work. Americans love general principles. Our theorists are not enough opportunists, and our men of practical affairs are still handicapped by the prejudice which assumes that anything they ask is wrong because a profit is sought.

Consider what is implied by the policy which says that the American who has business abroad must not look to have his establishments safeguarded. Or the full depth of the folly displayed when American railroad men were practically told they must not build railroads in China. Yet the onslaught on what was called "dollar diplomacy" was popular.

The commercial diplomacy of the post-war period demands a better understanding of many matters by the American public. Nations with internal bonds tightened by the war may be expected to be competitive as organized social groups. Such is the outlook, and to prepare American opinion will be a work of great magnitude, calling for the revision of many accepted ideas.

Miss Elsie Janis, A. E. F.

Many Americans did many admirable things in the war, but we know of nothing with greater muzzle velocity to cheer and serve and inspire and heal than the classic cartwheels and other poignant drama enacted by Miss Elsie Janis for the benefit of the A. E. F.

Noise of her doings has come back in various forms. Young reporters have written dithyrambs. Seasoned, grizzled correspondents took to sonnets. Buck privates vie with colonels in expounding just how Miss Janis entered an improvised theatre in a railway repair shop riding on the cowcatcher of a locomotive. Often—usually—she did her programme over and over again, ten times in close succession, to as many audiences. And anybody who heard the tenth performance saw just as much immortal pep and inimitable grace and charm as those who heard the first.

There was no tiring Miss Janis. There was no spot too weird, too impossible, too close to front lines or Gothas or horrors or noise or danger to daunt her. She had the spirit of the A. E. F. to the tip of her tongue and to the last wheeling toe. Our salutations to her on her safe return, a true artist and a brave American.

No More "Riders"

The House Committee on Rules has made an excellent start by refusing to allow a daylight saving repeal amendment to be fastened as a "rider" on the agricultural appropriation bill. The "rider" is a vicious device. The rules of the House forbid general legislation in an appropriation bill. The reason for this prohibition is sound. Appropriation measures have a right of way because they merely provide money to do work estimated for or already authorized by law. Restrictions on the content of appropriation bills facilitate their passage by eliminating contentious matter. Different rules govern the consideration of general legislation. It is, therefore, a clear violation of the House and Senate codes to fasten general legislation on money bills. It also opens the way to demoralizing log-rolling and favoritism.

In war all rules are suspended. Much general legislation was saddled on the appropriation measures in 1917 and 1918. But the war emergency is over. The daylight saving repealers emphasized that fact by bringing their proposition forward. Yet the Committee on Rules in the last House treated the repeal as if it was, in fact, a war measure and helped to rush it through last February without any pretence of public discussion.

The daylight repeal bill ought to have no more privileges than the Calder daylight saving act had when it was under consideration. It should be passed, if it is passed, in the established way, subject to ordinary delay and debate. We are satisfied that the support it seems to have in the House is factitious. But, in view of the alleged strength of that support, the Committee on Rules did a courageous thing in refusing to waive the anti-rider regulation for its benefit. This is a good beginning. It encourages the belief that for this Congress, at least, the offensive legislative "rider" has been dismounted.

Danish Mary surely is entitled to a small part of that consolation prize, or is she to remain the unrewarded heroine?

The "old diplomacy" that is menacing the world again was made in Germany.

The Wheat Harvest Problem

(From The Topeka Capital)

Harvesting a two hundred million bushel wheat crop is a serious problem which Kansas faces, to be accomplished within a few weeks. Wheat cutting cannot be put off. State Farm Labor Director Frizell, of Larned, calls for 220,000 men to harvest the crop, more than half of this immense army of workers to be brought in from other states. There are still in the army, unavailable for harvest hands, more than twice as many Kansas men as a year ago, and Kansas therefore is shorthanded to an extent that it has never been before.

With high wages in other occupations it is not easy to induce men to come into the wheat harvest. The pay is good enough, but the job does not attract men who have permanent employment. For harvest hands Kansas must rely largely on former men in the S. A. T. C.

"If the wheat isn't harvested as soon as it is ripe, it is lost," Mr. Frizell told Kansas City this week. "We can put off our corn, our hay and our alfalfa, but we can't put off wheat. The crop this year is going to be worth $475,000,000."

It is worth a supreme effort to save the whole of it.

A Question of Vermin

(From The Kansas City Star)

A New Jersey town is reported to have kept itself free of Bolshevism by threatening to wash any red card agitator found within its limits.

The Conning Tower

AN ATHALETIC ROM'NCE

Hal Hawker was a gladiator.
He soldered up his radiator
And claimed the ocean bridgeable
By plane, if not dirigible.
He picked a good locality
And warned the Admiralty.
I'll wager all I have he ate
Before he tried to aviate.
He banked on neither Spanish
Tramp schooners, Dutch nor Danish.
If he could on the ground land—
The Azores or Newfoundland—
Escape without a wound,
Nor have his engine ruined,
And follow the equator
With unclogged carburetor,
He'd get his rivals' goat,
Inspire a many a poet,
He'd boost the old Rolls-Royce,
And cop Alf Harmsworth's purse.
So he soared above the drink,
Amazed his land and king,
And brown as any berry
Was picked up by the Mary.
All honor to Hal Hawker!
I'll say that bird's a corker.

C. A.

If Prohibition were put to a popular vote there is a chance that more people would vote for it than against it; but the daylight saving repeal bill would be defeated by a 10 to 1 majority. The only class opposed to daylight saving—except some of the farmers—are the tennis reporters. When a match doesn't end until 8:30, and the courts are at least an hour from the shop, it takes speed and adroitness for the reporter to have his copy in by 9:30—which is the sporting page deadline these hurried evenings.

Variety's Golden Days

Sir: How many of your readers ever saw Dave Warfield do a female impersonation? Yet I remember him well, way back in 1890 or thereabouts, doing a specialty in "O'Dowd's Neighbors" at the Windsor Theatre, Bowery and Canal Street. Mark Murphy was the star of the show, and Warfield appeared in a Jimmie Russell makeup and gave an Irish servant girl's impressions of Sarah Bernhardt.

Just a few blocks north of the Windsor was Harry Miner's, a popular burlesque house. Sam Bernard was a part owner of "The Broadway Burlesquers," and in the company were McAvoy and May, who afterward appeared on Broadway. On the right end of the chorus (it numbered ten in those days) was a big blonde, with a powerful contralto voice. Can any of your readers remember her as Emma Carus? Sam Devere sang shady songs. But in his company was a wonderful musical artiste, Lillie Western. She played "Then You'll Remember Me" on the bells, and finished her act with the "Poet and Peasant" overture on the xylophone. Peter F. Dailey was a member of the "Horseshoe Four," and Billy Van as a bellhop appeared funnier to me than he did last year as the star of "The Rainbow Girl" at the New Amsterdam.

And two blocks further north was the London Theatre, another popular home of burlesque. What a howl the regular patrons made when a speculator made his first appearance and sold the first five rows regularly 50c—for 60c. Weber and Fields brought a "straight variety" company of eight numbers here every year. Besides the stars, who did their famous pool table sketch, Johnny Carroll sang "I Loved You Better Than You Knew," Lottie Gilson, "The Little Magnet," sang "Little Willie Knew Just What to Do." Staley and Drummond did a musical act in a blacksmith shop and then made an instant transformation into a ballroom, and Maude Huth did a single. Later on she doubled up with Billy Clifford, the first of the "silly ass" type. I remember his blank stare and the laugh when he asked his partner "Well, if you had a sister, would she care for Charlotte Russe?" One burlesque company (the name escapes me) had on its roster Matthews and Bulger, the De Witt Sisters and Will West. They all appeared later on in Broadway productions. One comedy quartet had Jack Gardner, later of "Mme. Sherry" fame, and Al Shean, who is now playing Sam Bernard's former part in "Friendly Enemies" at the Hudson Theatre. And John and Harry Kernell? Well, what's the use of lamenting?

W. J. S.

The team that did the musical blacksmith act in our day was Staley and Birbeck. We fail to recall Billy Clifford's Charlotte Russe gag, but if he sprang it he must have lifted it from "Lord Dundreary."

The pleasures of the memory, as M. T. Cicero used to say, are not surpassable; which accounts for the fact that contribs enjoy writing their variety show reminiscences. We enjoy reading 'em, for one, and as this Plinth of Piffle is constructed with no other thought than our own delight, we shall keep printing them as long as they continue to amuse and thrill.

Variety acts may not have improved in the past twenty-five years, but automobile service stations, fountain pens, coaster brakes, linotyping, and safety razors are much better than they were in 1894.

Gotham Gleanings

—It's a boy at Dave Lawrence's and Dave is handing out the cigars.

—Jimmy Montague has left the employ of Will Hearst and is about to buy a new auto.

—Gene O'Connell's little girl, Patricia May, was 1 mo. old yesterday.

—Frank Butler of New Rochelle motored up to the Adirondack Mts. over the recent holidays.

—Jack Calder of Utica and the Motor Park near St. Nazaire will be married 2 wks. from to-morrow to Miss Pauline Carmichael of Springfield, Mass.

—Friday was Decoration Day for lots of folks, but it was just Friday for ye scribe.

—Bert Green of Mt. Vernon is spending 3 wks. in Gotham.

—News are scarce at this writing.

—Here it is June again, one of the best known of the months.

Mac's husband calls it the Ladies' Home *Journal*, Marion the Ladies' *Home* Journal, and the s. y. t. at the newsstand the *Ladies'* Home Journal. And Mac wonders whether there may not be a clew here—a subconscious stepping on the gas at the Sign of the Psychic Interest. Not that it matters.

For example, some say *last* line.

And some last *line*. F. P. A.

Self-Gagged "Liberals"

By W. T. Ghent

Of the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy.

This is the conclusion of a series of articles in which Mr. Ghent has examined in detail the four "liberal" weeklies, "The New Republic," "The Nation," "The Dial" and "The Survey," in relation to the publication of facts about Russia.

THE last of the "liberal" periodicals clamorous for the "truth about Russia" to be considered here is "The Survey." For the service of "The Survey" in its proper field of representing and reporting the work of the various social agencies of the country I have only praise. I am concerned here only with its newly added rôle of furthering Bolshevist propaganda.

A careful search of the issues from November 2 to April 5 reveals a vast deal of Bolshevist matter, but an almost total absence of anything unfavorable to Bolshevism. In a letter to the editor printed in the issue of January 11, a correspondent, though favoring the Bolshevist programme, censures the Bolsheviki for having abandoned the war and risked a German victory. In another letter in another issue a correspondent is permitted to enter a brief explanation in defence of the Czecho-Slovaks.

That is the total. If there is anything more it has eluded my careful search. Out of all the masses of testimony; out of the piles of documents, official and unofficial, out of the many statements of Bolshevist journals confirmatory of accusations against, the existing régime "The Survey" admits to its columns during this period not a line, not a word, to which Lenine could reasonably object.

Space for Bolshevist Matter

But it finds ample space for Bolshevist matter. A year ago its policy was evidently unformed. On July 27, in an article by Arthur Gleason on the British Labor party conference on June 26-28, it quoted briefly regarding the Bolsheviki from both Kerensky and Branting. Then followed a long, long silence. The silence was broken on November 16 by a non-committal section on Russia in a long article by Edward T. Devine. In the issue of December 14 a correspondent complains that the periodical had so far published no "thoroughgoing and comprehensive article" dealing with the soviet government. The reminder was not without effect; and though the particular thing asked for has not been given, there have been columns and pages of outright Bolshevist propaganda.

In the issue of January 11 appeared a Bolshevist account of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society annual dinner in New York City, stressing the demand for "information about Russia"; two letters to the editor, one of which complained about the misrepresentation of Russian conditions (presumably by the "capitalist" press), and an editorial or sub-editorial on the publication by "The Nation" of the soviet constitution.

The Suggestive Method

It is in this last-named composition that the tyro in the science of apologetics may learn the value of insinuation over misrepresentation. We are told that the document "contains no compromise whatever between the democracy as understood by the Bolshevik philosophy and that promulgated by Western nations"; that "complete freedom of assembly and of press is assured"; and that "there is, at any rate not in this constitution, any suport for the assumption the central government is animated by a desire to assume autocratic control."

Now if the editorial writer on "The Survey" had been assiduous in gathering that real information about Russia which he professes to yearn for, he would know that the Bolshevist leaders and the Bolshevist press make no pretence of democracy—that they have expressly and repeatedly renounced it. He would know further that there has been no freedom of speech and press under the soviet constitution, and that the fact is admitted by the Bolsheviki themselves. And he would also know that the central power under the present rule is an oligarchy; that it denies participation in government to disaffected elements and that it crushes by force the numerous revolts against its authority. Yet he has sought to suggest to the credulous that the rule of the Bolsheviki is a mere variant of democracy as it is known to the Western nations, and that because certain fundamental violations of democracy are not expressly provided for in the soviet constitution, therefore they are not practised.

These four "liberal" periodicals, "The New Republic," "The Nation," "The Dial" and "The Survey," have much to say, from time to time, of the rigidity of the official censorship. Yet this censorship has, as they admit, sometimes unintentionally permitted a forbidden matter to pass. One may imagine with what painstaking security the editorial censorship on things Russian is practised when in the case of three of these periodicals it obtains a virtually total exclusion of even a suggestion unfavorable to Bolshevism, and in the case of the fourth an exclusion of everything except what is regarded as harmless. If there is any chapter in the history of American journalism more disgraceful than that furpished by these periodicals, I do not know where it is to be discovered.

The four "liberal" periodicals treated are the leaders of the Bolshevist propaganda in America. The radical or extremist press takes from them its cue and a large part if its material. Of course, it carries the argument further. No mealy-mouthed camouflage of words disguises its attitude regarding the establishment of soviet government in America. It is for just that thing. But in the matter of the suppression or distortion of the facts about Russia it plays exactly the game of the perodicals of "light and leading."

With the Radicals

The romantic anarcho-socialist "Liberator," the doctrinaire Socialist "Radical Review," "The Class Struggle" and "The Socialist Labor People," the I. W. W. "New Solidarity" and "The Rebel Worker," the Left-Wing Socialist "Revolutionary Age," the regular Socialist "Daily Call," "Eye Opener," "Milwaukee Commonwealth," "Oakland World," "Ohio Socialist" and "Los Angeles New Justice" are all, with certain doctrinal reservations here and there, for sovietism in America. I do not see the "Volkszeitung" and the Jewish "Forward," but I presume that they are at one with their journalistic comrades. Even "The Appeal to Reason," which up to last November was opposed to sovietism and was willing to print real information about Russia, has switched about, and with Upton Sinclair as chief editorial Bolshevist, has closed its columns to everything but the sort favorably censored by "The New Republic," "The Nation," "The Survey" and "The Dial."

They are not at peace with one another—these advocates of sovietism in America. They chant the same tune on the blessings of Bolshevism and the alleged lying of the "capitalist" press, and they practise the game of suppression and distortion with a marvellous uniformity. But as to how, when and by whom sovietism is to be introduced, they are in angry and vociferous disagreement. The Socialist Labor party "People," in commenting at great length on the strife between the Left-Wingers and the Right-Wingers in the Socialist party, calls it a case of "swine rending swine." "The Revolutionary Age," a Left-Wing exponent, keeps up a running fire on the Right Wing, on the Socialist Labor party, on the I. W. W. and on the "bourgeois liberals," otherwise the former members of the Socialist party who left that organization because of its attitude on the war. Of course the Right-Wingers are not silent; nor are the I. W. W.

No Guarantees

There is not one of these groups that would not, on the moment of coming to power, abolish every one of the ordinary guarantees of freedom. There is not one of them which would not, in its determination to hold on, resort to the intimidation of force; and the slightest word of expostulation from any of these sentimentalists of the "liberal" press who had fed and nourished this thing, but who now "realized that it was something more than they had counted on," would bring down upon the protestant a swift vengeance. "Freedom of speech," "the rights of minorities," "self-determination," are phrases for present use; the fanatics who "revolution with rosewater" would abandon them the moment power was achieved. The cynical apology for repression, "you can't win a revolution with rosewater," would be heard instead; and it would be immediately apparent that the only minority that has rights of self-determination and freedom of speech is that minority sheltered by bayonets.

Bolshevism is terroristic reaction. It is an old foe with a new face. It is the thing that labor, both radical and moderate, has steadfastly fought against since the days of Bakunin. Under unique conditions, unparalleled in the world's history, it has achieved power in Russia. Sentimentalists, faddists, utopians, enthralled by the magic of a momentous and remote happening, are chanting its praises; and revolutionary extremists are proposing its world-wide extension. The issue is clear; and labor, which has most to lose from social disintegration and demoralization, cannot do else but throw its united strength against this menace to civilization.

Fake Heroes

By Wilbur Forrest

COBLENZ, Germany, May 10.—"The Ameroc," the American Army of Occupation's official daily newspaper, which voices the sentiments of those who guard the Rhine bridgehead, prints the following editorial in its issue of May 5:

"Besides the Bolshevist liars that are abroad in the States trying to detract from the heroic acts of men who played important roles in the A. E. F., one must not lose sight of the fact that there are many men in and out of uniform, who have never seen service, doing gross injustice to the men who came overseas and fought the war.

"These are the men who wear service and wound chevrons to which they are not entitled. This type is greatly in the minority in the part they play in tearing down public opinion, public regard for the men who deserve merit for their services.

"Most dangerous is the man who lands on the dock and immediately begins blowing his horn in the newspapers of how he won the war single-handed. Scores of these liars have already been uncovered and scores more will be publicly branded as falsifiers when the members of the Third Army return home.

"Nothing is more encouraging to the conscientious objector or the lady-finger-eating lounge lizard, who stayed at home, than to see stories of fake heroism perpetrated. Every story of this kind printed causes the genuine hero to be doubted when he arrives on the scene.

"The folks at home are getting fed up on the fake hero stories. It is getting so, according to recent letters received from the States from men who were decorated for their bravery while in the A. E. F., that a real soldier is discredited in certain quarters until he can produce credentials. But there are men now out of uniform who even show decorations and claim to have won them, when in reality they spent the last two years simply getting the benefits of military training in some comfortable barracks back in the States.

"Is there not a need of legislation which will permit the punishment of fakers along this line? And if there is legislation, why are the men who are back to civil life lying about glorious deeds they alleged they accomplished not punished? A law that is not enforced is not a law. The War Department is not to blame, for after a man leaves the ranks he is without the pale of military jurisdiction in these matters.

"It is the duty of every man in the A. E. F. to expose these fakers when he goes home. While he is here he should expose them by letters. Bring the attention of editors to lying interviews you see printed in your home paper. For liars should not reap the reward of the brave. Valor does not live in fakers."

Saving Daylight Spoils the Cow

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to say a word in reference to your article of this morning on page 12 of The Tribune, entitled "Daylight Saving Imperilled." I have no objection as a resident of New York City to the daylight saving plan, but I am the owner of a dairy farm in upper New York, and as a dairy farmer I am very much opposed to the daylight saving law and am absolutely in favor of its being repealed.

In your article you make the one sensible suggestion that has ever been made concerning dairy farmers in connection with this law, and that is that the train schedule for milk should be run one hour later, or by sun time. This one thing would make the life of the dairy farmer livable, but when you consider that the dairy farmer must get up in the morning under the new law at 3:30 by sun time, and that every dairy barn has to be lighted by electric or gas lights, as the case may be, in order that the farmer may have light enough to milk and feed his cows, you will not be so insistent upon the saving of gas and electric light for the ordinary housekeeper. As a matter of fact, the housekeeper in the city does not save anything in the way of lights during the summer by the clock being turned forward. Those residing in the city only gain by getting a better use of their late afternoons and evenings, but this is quite beside what I consider the greatest evil of all, and this evil is done to the cow herself, and as a result the farmers lose millions of dollars thereby. All animal life lives according to sun time. You cannot change their habits by turning the clock forward.

Cows, in order to give the most efficient service in the dairy business, must be milked at exact periods of twelve hours each. If you milk the cow in the morning at 4:30 you must milk her in the afternoon at 4:30; if you milk her in the morning at 5, she must be milked in the afternoon at 5, etc. To disturb a cow in the morning before her rest is completed means a loss of milk, and to disturb her again in the afternoon means a greater loss. Cows graze through the cool of the forenoons and go and lie down in the shade in the middle of the day and until 4 o'clock or 4:30 in the afternoon, thus being able to masticate their food of the morning and to rest in the coolest possible places away from the worst ravages of their arch enemy, the fly, after which they of their own accord get up and feed again.

Under the daylight saving law the cow must be disturbed every morning and every afternoon. It makes no difference what you do with the clock, the cow goes to bed again with the sun after the cool of the evening has come on. She does not go to bed by the clock, and if she is disturbed an hour earlier every morning, an hour is taken off of her night's rest. This does not happen just one day, because the cow does not get used to this sort of régime. No matter what time she gets up in the morning she goes to bed at night at the same hour. It is again so after the forenoon's browse, she lies down at an exact hour by the sun to "chew her cud" or masticate her food, and thus according to the new law she is again disturbed at 3:30 by the sun time in the afternoon, the very hottest time, and must be made to get up, and she is driven in by the farmer to the barns without having the opportunity for her hour's browsing in the afternoon.

Any one with the slightest bit of scientific thought can see at once the effect of this daily disturbing of the cow upon the flow of her milk. I caused to be made at my farm last summer a careful investigation and trial upon my herd of cows, and by the new régime the cow gave an average of two quarts of milk less per day than if not disturbed and left to go by the old law. This I attribute absolutely to the disturbing of the cow twice a day and the curtailing of her rest. If any one doubts this, just let him go out into the country and hunt up the cows at 3:30 in the afternoon by the sun time. He will find the condition just as I said, and he will pity the cow as he drives her the half-mile to a mile across the burning sun-heated pastures to her barn.

Now, supposing there are 300,000 cows in the State of New York, and each cow by being thus disturbed gives an average of two quarts less of milk per day, what would be the financial loss to the farmer thereby? It would be the value of 600,000 quarts of milk, would it not? So that in the summer's season more money is lost to the farmer than any one could possibly imagine without sitting down and putting it in figures.

The effect produced upon the cow in relation to her rest is produced upon all other animal life. All animals rise in the morning and go to bed at night by sun time, and under the "daylight saving" law every horse that works on the farm must be disturbed before his rest is over every solitary morning. There is something more in life than accommodating humanity; we must take into consideration also the feelings of animal life. We cannot govern the habits of animal life. They learned with the beginning of time to lie down and sleep when darkness came on and to arise with the dawn. To change their habits is an impossibility, so that if we disturb an animal one hour before his rest is completed in the morning we have taken away one hour of that animal's night's rest every night.

If the railroads and handlers of milk products would consent to run their milk trains according to the winter schedule and the farmers be made to understand that they were not expected to run their farms by the daylight saving law, there would be no harm done the farmer through this law. The law in itself, if it must be obeyed by the farmer, is the most deplorable injustice that has ever been put upon any single class of people.

Then there is another thing, the farmer must have some rest at night, and if he must get up in the morning at 4:30, which he is compelled to do, he must go to bed at 8:30, but under the daylight saving law he has to go to bed at 7:30 by sun time, which is oftentimes before the sun has gone down. Any one can readily understand that the farmer who has worked the whole day long under the terrific heat rays of the sun, can get very little rest by going to bed before the sun has yet gone down and the evening partly cooled off.

The men who are crying so strongly for the daylight saving law should be compelled to go out on the farm and live for a week and follow the farmer around in his daily tasks. They would soon find out the terrible injustice that is done the farmer.

WILLIAM WADE HINSHAW.

New York, May 28, 1919.